

collection a remarkable modification (but whether locally constant or not there is at present no means of telling) of *Deiopeia pulchella*; in this form the black spots of primaries are run together into angulated macular stripes, the discoidal cell to the middle is greyish, and the black interrupted border of the secondaries is widened, so as to enclose the central marginal white spot. As in some varieties of *D. pulchella*, there is no spot or dash at the end of the cell. One example only was obtained at Alu.

XXX.—*Last Words on Professor Claus.*

By E. RAY LANKESTER, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.*

I HAVE not the intention of following Prof. Claus in the use of offensive language, such as "sophistical falsification &c." At the same time I am anxious, before quitting this controversy, to say a few words, in order to demonstrate to the reader what the actual position is; and I shall leave to others the task of assigning the descriptive terms appropriate to Prof. Claus's conduct.

If the reader will be so good as to refer to my article of April 1886, in this Magazine, he will find that I there drew attention to the fact that Prof. Claus had published an article embodying certain views as to the classification of the Arthropoda which were identical with those expressed in a series of publications by myself, and that nevertheless Prof. Claus, although he had not previously given expression to these views and now published them as something "hitherto" unrecognized, yet omitted altogether to make any reference to my published statements on the subject.

I thought it right to point out and condemn this omission, the more so as I knew that Prof. Claus had previously been shown by other zoologists to have exhibited a want of discrimination in such matters.

I did not, of course, expect that Prof. Claus would confess the objectionable nature of his proceeding. He has contributed two articles on this subject to this magazine, in which a certain amount of ingenuity must be admitted; but, in spite of the efforts made by him, the candid reader who reviews the whole controversy will admit that Prof. Claus did actually

* [This discussion must now cease. The matters in dispute have been very fully ventilated, and our readers will be able to form their own conclusions. We may remark, however, that neither in the original nor in the abridged translation do we find all the "hithertos" which Prof. Lankester here inserts between inverted commas.—EDS. *Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist.*]

and deliberately omit to cite and acknowledge the works of a predecessor which he ought to have cited and acknowledged, and that his articles in this magazine are, at the best, but lame excuses for a proceeding which is reprehensible.

When the facts stated by Prof. Claus are dissected out from the mass of misleading sneers and accusations with which he surrounds them, it is established:—

1st. That Prof. Claus, in his article in the 'Anzeiger' of the Vienna Academy, announced (a) as a "hitherto unrecognized" fact that the Acarina are degraded members of the class Arachnoidea; (b) that "hitherto" the Gigantostaca were regarded as Crustacea; (c) that "hitherto" an erroneous division of the Arthropoda into Branchiata and Tracheata had prevailed, which should be abandoned; (d) that "hitherto" it has been overlooked that the Hexapoda, Myriapoda, and *Peripatus* are united by the fact that they retain the prostomial antennæ found also in Chætopod worms, which are altogether absent in the Arachnida; (e) that "hitherto" a single origin had been assigned to tracheæ, whereas it was probable that they had originated independently in Arachnida and the other Tracheates.

2. That, contrary to the statements and pretensions of Professor Claus, these identical conclusions in their entirety and as related one to another had been previously formulated by me as the result of special studies, and published several years (1881) before the date of Prof. Claus's communication to the Vienna Academy (1886).

3. That the fundamental theory of a backward movement of the oral aperture in the Crustacea, and the consequent relative forward movement of primarily postoral appendages, so as to become secondarily præoral, was published by me in 1873 and adopted by Claus in 1876, who *added nothing to the facts as to nerve-supply* in relation to this matter, already established by Zaddach.

Professor Claus has endeavoured to justify himself by declaring that some of these views may be read between the lines here and there in his 'Grundzüge' and in his 'Crustaceensystem.' On the other hand, it is not possible for him to deny that the prominent and explicit statements on these points made in those publications are *contrary* to the views enunciated in his note in the Vienna 'Anzeiger,' and that were this not so he could not have brought these views before the Academy as novelties.

Whether the suggestion of such views may be obscurely visible in some isolated passages of Prof. Claus's previous writings or not, is not a matter which has any bearing on the

charge which I make against Prof. Claus. What I complain of is that he stated to the Vienna Academy that "hitherto" other views were held by zoologists, and that the views then announced by him were *novelties*. As a matter of fact they were not novel, but had been in so many words and in identical terms formulated by me five years before, and published as a special essay in a journal habitually studied by Prof. Claus. Moreover, these views were not obscurely hinted at by me in scattered passages of a treatise definitely supporting other and antagonistic views, but were all enunciated in logical sequence and made the subject of special discussion and investigation in the essay alluded to, "*Limulus* an Arachnid." This publication Professor Claus chooses to ignore in claiming novelty for the views published by him in the 'Anzeiger' five years after its appearance.

I leave the reader to classify the conduct of Prof. Claus in thus dealing with the published work of his contemporaries.

PROCEEDINGS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES.

GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

January 27, 1886.—Prof. T. G. Bonney, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S.,
President, in the Chair.

The following communications were read:—

1. "On the Fossil Mammalia of Maragha, in North-western Persia." By R. Lydekker, Esq., B.A., F.G.S., &c.

The Author alluded to the important memoirs of Messrs. Grewingk, Pohlig, and Rodler on the Maragha Mammalia, and having expressed the hope that his notice would be regarded as an attempt to assist rather than to interfere with their work, mentioned a collection of specimens from Maragha sent by Mr. Damou to the British Museum. He fully confirmed the conclusions already arrived at as to the identity of many of the Maragha mammals with those of Pikermi, and thought that *Giraffa attica*, *Palæoryx Pallasi*, *Sus erymanthius*, *Mastodon pentelici*, and *Helladotherium Duvernoyi* might be added to the list of species already recorded. He also recorded the French *Felis brevirostris*; a *Rhinoceros*, apparently allied to *R. antiquitatis*; and *R. Blanfordi*, of the north-west portion of India and China. The paper concluded with some observations regarding the relations of the Palæaretic and Oriental Pliocene faunas.

2. "On the Pliocene of Maragha, Persia, and its resemblance to that of Pikermi, in Greece; on Fossil Elephant-remains of Caucasia and Persia; and on the results of a Monograph of the Fossil Elephants of Germany and Italy." By Dr. H. Pohlig. Communicated by Dr. G. J. Hinde, F.G.S.

The principal object of the Author in making a geological tour